UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,289	02/20/2007	Atsushi Muraguchi	2870-0330PUS1	9388
	7590 05/17/201 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747		HOBBS, MICHAEL L		
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1797		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/17/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/573,289	MURAGUCHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MICHAEL HOBBS	1797		

	WIICHAEL HOBBS	1/9/	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a)⊠ They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		cied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		Impliant Amendment (1 1 OL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subiliited iii a separate,	intery filed afficianter	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 23-26 and 28-31.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-22</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	NOT I II II II II II	192 6 11	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		i condition for allowan	ce pecause:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	P10/5B/08) Paper No(s)		
/M. H./	/William H. Beisner/		
Examiner, Art Unit 1797	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797	
	• ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new limitation to claim 1 reciting the functional limitation of the interior surface preventing adhesion of an organic cell was not previously presented and would require further search and consideration on the part of the examiner. The added limitation to claim 31 also raises a new issue that was not previously addressed and would require further search and consideration upon the part of the examiner.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not found persuasive. In the fourth paragraph on page 8, applicant argues that the plate of Reed fails to anticipate the newly amended claim 31 where the microwell holds only one organic cell. This is not found persuasive since this limitation is drawn to the intended use fo the microwell and the cell constitutes material worked upon by an apparatus. Therefore, this newly added limitation fails to structurally define the claimed invention over the prior art (see also MPEP 2115 and 2114).

With regards to newly amended claim 23, applicant argues that the applicant argues that combined references teach away from the instant claim. This is not found persuasive as the applicant is arguing the intended use of the apparatus which does not structurally define the claimed invention over the prior art.